

shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

“Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.”

□ 1100

Mr. SCALISE. Amendment XXVI, Section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.”

Section 2:

“The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. CLINE. Amendment XXVII:

“No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.”

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. VAN DREW) at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 185, TERMINATING CDC REQUIREMENT FOR PROOF OF COVID-19 VACCINATION FOR FOREIGN TRAVELERS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 24, DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 26, DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REVISED CRIMINAL CODE ACT OF 2022

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 97

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debat-

able for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit (if otherwise in order).

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 26) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit (if otherwise in order).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 97 provides for consideration of three measures: H.R. 185, H.J. Res. 24, and H.J. Res. 26.

The rule provides for H.R. 185 to be considered under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that in only our second week after organizing, this Republican majority has already tied House Democrats in the number of times a structured rule makes in order more minority amendments than majority amendments. In the 117th Congress, House Democrats only reported one structured rule making in order more Republican amendments than Democratic amendments. Clearly, House Republicans are delivering a more open and transparent legislative process for the American people.

The rule further provides for consideration of two measures, H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 26, under closed rules with 1 hour of debate each equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the

Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

H.R. 185 would finally end the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's proof of COVID-19 vaccination requirement for foreign travelers entering the United States.

This legislation should receive broad, bipartisan support. After all, it was President Biden in September 2022 who acknowledged that "the pandemic is over."

Life has returned to normal across the country. Yet, despite the world moving on from the pandemic, this administration persists in retaining an unnecessary vaccination requirement for those visiting the United States.

Maintaining this mandate has led to great hardship for many Americans, including those in my own district in western New York. People have been separated from their family, their friends, and loved ones for years. It is time that we acknowledge that these vaccine mandates do not definitively stop the spread of COVID. It is time for Congress to act where this administration refuses and finally end this mandate.

Additionally, the rule before us provides consideration of H.J. Res. 24, a resolution disapproving of the District of Columbia's Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, a law which would allow noncitizens of the U.S. to vote in D.C.'s local elections.

Citizenship is at the core of our society. It represents an acceptance of duties and privileges, including the right to vote. The oath of allegiance for newly naturalized individuals includes the following: "I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty."

These aren't just words. This is a pledge of loyalty to this country and an assumption of responsibilities as a citizen.

With the enacting of the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, the District of Columbia has violated the core idea of what it means to be a citizen of this great country.

America is not a geographic expression where the concept of citizenship and sovereignty is meaningless or relative. We are a sovereign nation and a sovereign people. It is Congress' right and responsibility to step in and right a wrong that threatens one of the pillars of our democracy—the right of citizens to vote.

Finally, this rule provides before us the consideration of H.J. Res. 26, disapproving of the District of Columbia's Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

In the past few years, murders, rapes, carjackings, robberies, and theft have skyrocketed here in our Nation's Capital. The District of Columbia's law enforcement remains understaffed and overwhelmed by the soaring rates of

violent crime. Residents have routinely registered this concern, as a recent poll showed 75 percent of D.C. residents sought more police officers and safer streets.

Yet, the D.C. Council, in their infinite wisdom, chose not to heed the concerns of D.C. residents or its many visitors and, instead, approved the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, a bill patterned after the disastrous policies already implemented in Democratic-led cities across this country.

The Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 will drastically reduce sentences for violent offenders and make it easier than ever before for those offenders to obtain early release. To be clear, when I say "violent offenders," I am referring to those convicted of murder, rape, and other seriously horrific crimes.

Additionally, D.C.'s revised criminal code provides a right to a jury trial for a slew of misdemeanors, forcing the court system, already strained, to take on a new workload. Not only does this deprive Americans of their right to a speedy trial, but it will also deny victims resolution and closure against perpetrators of serious offenses as they face an overwhelmed and understaffed justice system.

Democratic leadership in most major cities across this country are trading the safety of Americans for the lawlessness of their pie-in-the-sky policies that, in reality, let violent offenders go, reduce sentences, avoid prosecution, and deny victims justice.

Just downstate from my own district, New York City has seen its crime rate skyrocket by 22 percent since this time last year alone. Arrests linked to shootings and homicides jumped 12 percent in just 1 year.

In Chicago, Illinois, the homicide rate is up a whopping 34 percent from 2019.

In San Francisco, businesses from mom-and-pop shops to national retail chains have closed their doors. They have laid off workers because they can't afford to stay open in a city whose leadership refuses to prosecute basic offenses like theft and shoplifting.

Now, not to be outdone, the District of Columbia has chosen to import these dangerous and disastrous policies.

Just last week, only a mile or so away from this Capitol, a gunman went on a rampage at the Potomac Avenue Metro Station. A Metro employee, 64-year-old Robert Cunningham, was killed, and three people were injured.

This tragic event is just one more in a wave of violent crime that has swept across the District of Columbia in recent years. Yet, the D.C. Council seems unperturbed as it steamrolls ahead with a policy that will only make the District, its residents, and the many visitors to this city, our Nation's Capital, less safe.

Residents of D.C. have the same rights as other Americans to be secure in their homes and to be protected

against crimes committed against their lives, their families, and their property. Putting violent offenders back on the streets and reducing sentences for violent crimes will only endanger the lives of D.C. residents.

It is our duty as Members of Congress, as laid out in the D.C. Home Rule Act, to disapprove of a policy like this that threatens the safety of this city's residents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, 6 weeks into a new Congress, and the Republican majority has yet to bring substantive, serious legislation to the floor that does anything to address the serious issues confronting our great Nation.

Instead, we have seen Republican leadership buckle under time and again to the demands of a rightwing minority that seems more interested in stoking controversy and conspiracy theories than crafting actual legislation or governing.

Instead of delivering for the American people, we have seen precious time and taxpayer dollars wasted in power struggles and political stunts, rather than doing the people's business.

True to that pattern, today's rule provides for the consideration of three deeply problematic measures, measures that further the objectives of that extremist minority, measures that stoke division, that undermine government institutions, and that threaten fundamental American freedoms when they don't align with the radical right's ideology.

By caving to these fringe forces, Republican leadership is squandering precious time and taxpayer dollars that would be better spent working together on the issues most Americans want us to address: lowering prices; housing, healthcare, and education needs; making our communities safer; and protecting our planet.

The first two resolutions under consideration today would nullify legislation recently passed by the democratically elected D.C. Council and, in the process, would undermine the fundamental right of citizens of Washington, D.C., to political self-determination.

□ 1245

H.J. Res. 24 would overrule the Local Resident Voting Rights Act, which was recently passed by the D.C. Council.

With this measure, the citizens of D.C. decided to join other municipalities around the country in allowing noncitizen residents to vote in local D.C. elections.

H.J. Res. 26 would nullify the Revised Criminal Code Act, the RCCA, which reformed D.C.'s criminal code. That code has not been comprehensively revised since it was first enacted in 1901.

The American people expect their Members of Congress to prioritize their most pressing kitchen table issues, but instead of focusing on lowering costs or creating better-paying jobs, we are here today to interfere with legislation duly enacted by the citizens of D.C. and their government.

Not only is that not what our constituents sent us to do, it is distinctly antidemocratic to substitute our policy judgment for the local policy judgment of D.C.'s elected officials.

The nearly 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are worthy and capable of self-government.

Instead of seeking to undo the work of that democratically elected body, we should be holding hearings and considering whether it is finally time to address the issue of D.C. statehood.

As my colleague, Mr. RASKIN, said in the Rules Committee yesterday, if my Republican colleagues insist on acting as a colonial overseer of the District of Columbia, the least they can do is hear from the people of D.C.

Those promoting these resolutions should have called a hearing or at least attempted to engage the D.C. Council and community leaders in some way.

If my colleagues think they have the best interests of the people of D.C. at heart, let's hear from the D.C. residents.

I believe they have made it quite clear they don't appreciate being made a pawn in national political battles.

We owe it to the people of D.C. to enact statehood, not this radical attempt to interfere with the district's Democratic process.

The subject of these disapproval resolutions, the Revised Criminal Code Act and Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, should be irrelevant.

But just so we are clear, let's look at the legislative history of those two acts that our colleagues across the aisle want to overturn.

Under the D.C. Home Rule Act, which is a Federal statute, the democratically elected 13-member D.C. Council is required to enact a new law twice, with at least 13 days intervening between each vote, in order to pass legislation.

Legislation passed by the council and affirmed by the Mayor or with a veto override is then transmitted to Congress for a review period.

The legislation takes effect at the expiration of the review period unless Congress intervenes by passing a resolution of disapproval.

Congress has only overturned duly elected D.C. laws three times before the misguided efforts that we are forced to consider today.

Now, the D.C. Council passed the Revised Criminal Code Act by votes of 12-0 and 13-0. While the Mayor vetoed it, the council voted to override that veto by a vote of 12-1.

The Revised Criminal Code Act is the culmination of a 5-year process to revise and update D.C.'s criminal code,

which, as mentioned previously, has not happened since it was first created over a century ago.

Everyone in the D.C. legal system, from prosecutors to judges to defense attorneys to scholars, agrees that this revision is long overdue.

Our colleagues across the aisle object to the revised criminal code that has been crafted with so much care to meet local conditions because they don't like some sentencing provisions that seek to match up the law with current standards.

They posit that harsher penalties would be a greater deterrent to the criminal conduct that they want to target when, in fact, the data shows that harsher penalties in some of the States that they represent does not, in fact, deter that conduct.

So think about this: Republican politicians from Georgia and Kentucky and Texas, who haven't bothered to take the time to hold a hearing or study this issue, have decided to parachute in and dictate to the 700,000 residents of D.C. that they know better than those residents and their elected Representatives how to run their city.

Can you imagine how those politicians would react if the D.C. Council tried to tell them how to run the jails in Athens, Georgia; Lexington, Kentucky; or Buffalo, New York?

What is particularly infuriating is that our Republican colleagues claim that they want to block the D.C. law because they want to be tougher on crime. But, once again, this is empty rhetoric. Overturning the D.C. criminal code will do nothing to increase public safety in D.C. or anywhere else.

As I mentioned at the outset, we are 6 weeks into the new Congress, and the Republican majority has not brought forward any legislation to address crime in America.

They won't consider legislation to block the flood of unregulated guns into American communities, they won't ban the weapons of war that take innocent lives in horrifying and predictably regular mass shootings, and they haven't taken any action to address the societal issues that produce violence.

The second resolution under consideration would vacate the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, which the D.C. Council passed by votes of 12-1 and 12-0 after holding hearings and soliciting public comment.

This act would allow otherwise qualified D.C. residents who are not U.S. citizens to vote in local D.C. elections.

Qualified noncitizen residents could vote in races for Mayor, council, attorney general, neighborhood commissioners, school district, and local referenda.

Of course, this does not apply to Federal elections. Our colleagues are trying to paint this legislation as some radical new idea, but there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution—which I understand was read here on the floor today, so we could check—that pro-

hibits noncitizens from voting in local, State, or Federal elections.

In fact, there is a long history in the U.S. of noncitizens being allowed to vote in those elections, and they have done so since at least 1704 in what would later become the U.S. At various points, 40 States have permitted noncitizens to vote. Congress only first prohibited noncitizens from voting in Federal elections in 1996.

Currently, there are at least 15 municipalities that permit noncitizens to vote in local elections. They do so in recognition of the fact that noncitizens, who are allowed to vote under such local laws, pay a variety of State, local, and Federal taxes, and they have an inherent interest in helping to shape policies in the communities where they live.

I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to oppose these profoundly undemocratic and paternalistic resolutions.

Now, today's rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 185, which would terminate the CDC requirement for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers to enter the U.S.

The CDC order was put in place to open the world back up and allow vaccinated foreign travelers to visit the U.S. while keeping our community safe.

Revising or revoking the COVID-19 public health guidance should be at the behest of public health experts with understanding and knowledge of global case trends, up-to-date data, and real-time safety information about emerging infections and COVID-19 epidemiology, not partisan politicians looking to settle political scores or curry favor with the disgraced former President and his base.

This bill would upend our current COVID-19 travel protocol, and worse, tie the hands of our public health experts by prohibiting any future order to require COVID-19 vaccinations as a condition of entering the United States.

As I said last week when the majority brought several bills to the floor attacking COVID-19 emergency declarations and vaccines, we shouldn't jeopardize our progress in fighting COVID with political stunts.

This is just the latest bill inspired by anti-vax conspiracy theories that has been rushed to the floor, uninformed by any hearings or any scientific evidence.

It is dangerous to repeatedly mislead the public about the efficacy of these vaccines that are proven to save lives.

This bill increases the risk of spreading new variants, just as hospitals and public health infrastructure are trying to rebuild.

Once again, an extremist fringe is putting politics over science and undermining public health experts at the expense of the American people, and Republican leadership is letting them get away with it.

We need Republican leaders to embrace science and promote the public

good, instead of undermining them to score political points.

I am disappointed that my colleagues continue to waste this body's time and taxpayer dollars on frivolous bills and resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the resolutions and bill we are considering today do not address the issues we were elected to address for the American people.

We have now been in this Congress for over a month and have yet to take up any serious legislation. I hope my colleagues can work in a bipartisan manner to address the problems our constituents sent us here to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we talk about following the science, I have to ask the question: France, Germany, Italy, Great Britain, they don't have a vaccine mandate for their visitors.

Are they following the science?

Are they in great peril?

Back to the matter of public safety. I think it is very important to point out that in letters to the leadership of this great body, the National Fraternal Order of Police, a union representing the men and women of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, they are proudly standing against the wrong-headed policies in the District of Columbia that overrode their Democratic Mayor's veto on this very legislation, as well as the D.C. Police Union itself in a letter to Speaker MCCARTHY doing the same.

Are they wrong? I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), my fellow Rules Committee member.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. He is new to the Rules Committee, and we have really enjoyed having him there so far.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution providing for consideration of three important bills.

H.J. Res. 24 and 26 would repeal two recent actions by the D.C. Council that would have drastic negative consequences nationwide.

The first would give illegal immigrants the right to vote in local elections. By pursuing this effort, D.C. leftists would dilute every lawful vote, which would have profound implications on all of our elections.

The second would further promote the left's soft-on-crime agenda. According to the Major Cities Chiefs Association, cities across the country have experienced increases in homicides by nearly 50 percent and aggravated assaults by over a third.

The so-called Revised Criminal Code Act would only accelerate these crime rates by eliminating mandatory minimums, reduce penalties for violent crimes, and bottle up local courts that

are paid for by the Federal Government—Federal tax dollars from across the country.

Under the D.C. Home Rule Act of 1973, Congress retains the ultimate say over affairs within the seat of our Federal Government.

The authority is derived under Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority over D.C., in "all cases whatsoever."

Congress has voted to overturn various D.C. efforts throughout the years, as recently as 2014. Western Minnesotans know these efforts will not simply remain in Washington. Radical leftists in the Twin Cities are pursuing similar efforts.

Recently, it was claimed at the Minnesota State Capitol that illegal immigrants are voting in droves. Western Minnesotans know that the Twin Cities' liberals will not be outdone by D.C. in promoting soft-on-crime policies.

My constituents know that if we do not take a stand, these radical ideas will continue to spread across the country.

Finally, I appreciate that Representative MASSIE's legislation to repeal the vaccine mandate for air travel is also included in this rule.

We still face issues at the land ports of entry in my district and across the northern border. It is my sincere hope that we also repeal a similar restriction on travel between the U.S. and Canada at land ports of entry in the coming weeks.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from The Sentencing Project advocacy group, which is signed by over a dozen civil rights organizations opposing the Republican efforts to obstruct the enactment of the District of Columbia's Revised Criminal Code Act.

It states: "Washingtonians know best how to address criminal justice policies in their community and deserve the right to determine their own laws. Local leaders are better positioned and retain more expertise to address safety and justice issues in the District than Congress."

THE SENTENCING PROJECT,

February 6, 2023.

Re Oppose efforts to obstruct the District of Columbia's Revised Criminal Code Act.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Chairman JIM JORDAN,
Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Rep. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JERRY NADLER,
Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to express our opposition to efforts to obstruct the District of Columbia's Revised Criminal Code Act, in-

cluding any resolution of disapproval or budget rider. The Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 (RCCA) is the product of 16 years of research, an expert commission, 51 public meetings, extensive public feedback, and robust negotiation. As such, the D.C. Council voted unanimously to pass the RCCA and the RCCA is supported by 83% of District voters. Opponents of the RCCA, however, are spreading misinformation about the RCCA's impact in a blatant attempt to erode home rule and trample on the rights of District residents. We urge you to oppose these attacks on the RCCA and vote against any resolution of disapproval.

Washingtonians know best how to address criminal justice policies in their community and deserve the right to determine their own laws. Local leaders are better positioned and retain more expertise to address safety and justice issues in the District than Congress. Federal overstepping to interfere with RCCA's implementation, which does not go into effect until 2025, would be inappropriate and misguided. The D.C. Council can continue to amend the RCCA, if desired, to address stakeholder concerns.

The RCCA is a long-overdue modernization of the D.C. Criminal Code. Since the 1960s, dozens of states have embarked on criminal code reforms, removing obsolete provisions, ensuring sentences are proportionate and equitable, and simplifying overlapping charges. The RCCA follows that trend—the District last comprehensively revised the criminal code in 1901. A revision to reflect best practices in sentencing and criminological evidence is necessary to ensure justice, fairness, and safety in the District. By ensuring the statutes are clear and constitutional, the RCCA makes the law easier for police officers, attorneys, and judges to understand and administer.

To arrive at that revision, the District engaged in a thorough, transparent, and evidence-based process. The D.C. Council created a Criminal Code Reform Commission (CCRC) which prepared recommendations based on a review of recent code reforms in other jurisdictions, current sentencing practices in D.C. Superior Court, court data, recommendations by the American Law Institute, social science, and the current sentencing guidelines. The CCRC Advisory Group, whose five voting members included representatives from the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and two professors from Georgetown University Law Center and George Washington University Law School, unanimously voted to approve the recommendations. The D.C. Council also made numerous changes to the introduced version of the bill, reflecting negotiations with the Metropolitan Police Department, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the Office of the Attorney General, the Public Defender Service, D.C. Superior Court judges, and members of the community. As Mayor Bowser acknowledged in her January 4, 2023 letter to D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson, there is "consensus agreement" on "95% of the bill."

The RCCA is a balanced bill—bringing the District in line with national sentencing norms by lengthening some sentences, reducing some maximums, and other reforms. The RCCA includes many modernizations, such as aligning D.C. with the majority of the country by creating the right to a jury trial for misdemeanors. The RCCA also lengthened sentences for several offenses and permits enhancements and stacking that can make the sentences much longer. The RCCA increases penalties for possession of assault rifles, ghost guns, and restricted explosive

devices, to 4 years from 1 year under current law. It also creates a new offense, endangerment with a firearm, which criminalizes discharging a firearm in a public place, or in a manner that creates a substantial risk of death. Additionally, the RCCA reduced the statutory maximum for certain offenses, in order to improve proportionality and reflect current sentencing practices, which are typically well below the maximum. As such, the sentence maximum changes in the RCCA are not expected to lower sentences for serious crimes. For example, the RCCA's 20-year maximum penalty for robbery is seven times higher than the median sentence imposed for robbery, and 11 years higher than the 97.5th percentile sentence imposed for robbery. For robberies and carjackings, over 97.5% of sentences currently imposed by judges are lower than the maximum allowable penalty outlined in the RCCA.

The people and leaders of the District support the RCCA. The RCCA is also backed by an abundance of research, data, and stakeholder feedback. Attempts by Congress to intervene are rooted in efforts to end home rule and falsehoods. We urge you to respect the will of Washingtonians and oppose all efforts, whether a resolution of disapproval or budget rider, to obstruct the RCCA.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union, American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia, Center for Disability Rights, DC Justice Lab, Drug Policy Alliance, Due Process Institute, FAMM, FWD.us, Justice Policy Institute, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, National Council for Incarcerated and Formerly Incarcerated Women and Girls, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, The Festival Center, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, The Sentencing Project.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), our esteemed colleague.

□ 1300

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I strongly oppose this rule. This rule would allow the House to consider two resolutions that would nullify two bills recently enacted by the District of Columbia's local legislature, the D.C. Council. These are profoundly undemocratic, paternalistic resolutions.

The House, in which the nearly 700,000 D.C. residents have no voting representation, is attempting to nullify a bill enacted by the D.C. Council, whose members are elected by and accountable to D.C. residents.

What is democracy? The dictionary defines it as a "government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections."

Perhaps President Lincoln described democracy best in the Gettysburg Address as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The D.C. Council has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. Eight members are elected by geographical area and five members are elected at-large. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office.

Congress has 535 Members. The Members are elected by residents of the several States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how Members vote, even on legislation that applies to the District of Columbia, such as the two disapproval resolutions, they can ask politely for residents of the several States to vote Members out of office.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or D.C. matters, and pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. residents pay more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more Federal taxes than 23 States.

Instead of abusing its power by nullifying legislation enacted by the D.C. Council, the House should adhere to democratic principles and pass my D.C. statehood bill, which would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full control over its local affairs.

I will have more to say on these undemocratic, paternalistic resolutions during floor debate on them on Thursday; but I will say to all Members of the House now: Keep your hands off of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, as a reminder, the resolutions before us today, they are not about the question of D.C. statehood. These are based on current law and not what we would like the law to look like as it relates to the District of Columbia.

Under the Home Rule Act, Congress has the ability, the responsibility, to provide oversight and review of policies enacted by the D.C. Government.

Let's also remember that the District of Columbia isn't just another town or locality. It is a Federal district. It is our Nation's capital. We have an obligation to protect the residents of this country in our Nation's capital.

The criminal justice revisions, as well as weakening the protections for the elections in the District of Columbia by opening it up to foreign nationals, go and fly directly in the face of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

The U.S. should be leading the free world right now but, instead, we are falling behind. Hundreds of countries have a vaccine policy that is more liberal than the United States at the moment.

If you live in Japan, Italy, Spain, Canada, the United Kingdom, Ukraine, Israel, Germany, France, Australia, South Africa, Egypt, Brazil, Taiwan, Mexico, all of our neighbors to the north and to the south, to the east and to the west have gotten rid of their COVID vaccine mandates to enter their

countries, but we have not. Why is that?

What is our policy right now?

To enter into the United States, if you are a foreigner, you have to have a COVID vaccine. Who can enter right now without a vaccine?

Well, if you are an illegal alien apprehended at the border and awaiting a trial or a hearing, you don't need a vaccine; just come on into the country, we will check it out later.

What if you are somebody who comes in and you have been vaccinated, but you have got a full-blown case of symptomatic COVID? Oh, you are vaccinated? No problem. Come on in. Bring your new variant, whatever it is. We will welcome you.

If you are a healthy tennis player who has not been vaccinated, then stay out of our country. That is the message that we have been sending.

Our policy is at least 2 years out of date. The U.S. Travel Association recognizes this. They said that every day this policy remains in place encourages some travelers to avoid the U.S., costing us valuable visitor spending and delaying our efforts to re-ignite inbound travel.

So our economy is suffering. But that is not really what compelled me to offer this bill. I am concerned about the families who have been separated for 3 years; children who haven't seen their parents; spouses who haven't seen each other, separated for 3 years.

There is no religious exemption in the vaccine mandate policy that the United States has. In fact, there are dictatorships that have better policies than ours right now: Iran, Russia, China, Cuba, Syria; oh, not vaccinated? Not a problem because they recognize at least the science behind it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule. During the debate, we are going to allow three amendments from the Democrats on my bill, and we are going to allow two Republican amendments. I think that is very kind of us. We didn't see this kind of openness and legislative deliberative process when the other party was in the majority.

Think about this as I close: Today, later in this Chamber, there will be over 1,000 people, sharing the oxygen, the air in this room with the President and the Vice President of the United States, and none of those thousand people that will be in this room have been mandated to take the vaccine.

So when you think about casting your vote on this, just consider for a second: Are you being a hypocrite?

None of your staff and none of the Members of this legislative body, or the Supreme Court, or the Senate who are going to join us here later today with the President, none of them have been mandated to take the vaccine. We shouldn't do the same.

We should not project xenophobia from this country. We should allow visitors; we should reunite families; and we should re-ignite our economy by eliminating this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am afraid we have to dig into the weeds a little bit with Rules Committee process right now.

Earlier, the gentleman from New York said that with this rule, the new majority has tied the number of times that more minority amendments were made in order than majority amendments.

While I am certainly supportive of minority amendments, that sounded wrong, so we asked our staff to check. They haven't had much time while we have been speaking, but they have already found at least two times that the Democratic majority did this in the last Congress, H.R. 302 and H.R. 963. Perhaps our colleagues need to check their facts.

What I do know is that this rule contains the 18th and 19th closed rules of this new Congress. That is already over 30 percent of what we did during the first year of the Democratic majority. So it is more like a return to Republican habits, just like they ran the most-closed Congress in history last time they had control.

I am also astonished to learn that it was the possibility of family separation that inspired our colleagues to introduce H.R. 185, when the issue of family separation due to our outmoded, broken immigration system has not served to inspire any urgency to reform that system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say we will all have an opportunity to debate this legislation in general debate. I do think it is important to frame the challenges that all of these particular initiatives have.

Frankly, let me, first of all, say that I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not let a very straightforward amendment which I think expresses the view of many of us to strike the entire text of H.R. 185.

During the pandemic, I organized a bipartisan COVID-19 task force. We worked very hard; included a Republican, a doctor, and other Members. We held meetings with doctors. We held meeting with scientists, hospital administrators. They were very grateful.

Many of you may have heard me say that I did over 70-plus testing sites and over 70-plus vaccination sites, going up to 150 in my community.

It is about the science. People understood the science and they gravitated toward vaccines. That means that any elimination of the requirement of foreign travelers should be on the science, not to be on the whims of individuals who believe that they are helping to unify families. It is about the science.

The reason why we are where we are today, even though there are 500 people getting COVID, and there are people dying every single day, is because more Americans believed in the science than

did not. That is why we developed this protection. So I think this is wrong-headed to have this legislation.

Finally, H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 26, disapproving the actions of the District of Columbia on voting rights and on the criminal code is, again, undermining local rule, and they have the right to local rule.

Constitutionally, everyone should have the right to equal protection under the law in the place where they are.

Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, should not have the intrusion of the United States Congress.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) my fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am glad to have him on the Rules Committee and glad to serve with him.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been asking what have we been doing over the last few weeks?

Well, I will tell you what we have been doing. We have been protecting babies born alive. We have been protecting families from the invasive audits of the Internal Revenue Service, or at least trying to if CHUCK SCHUMER doesn't block it; trying to protect the Strategic Petroleum Reserve from 200 million barrels being dumped by the President heading right into an election, lo and behold.

Now, how about protecting, last week, nurses and doctors from being fired for daring to want to protect their own health and well-being by not taking a shot, a shot which the CDC Director says does nothing for transmission of COVID. Those are the facts.

We are standing with the American people. American people are sick and tired of an overbearing Federal Government sticking its nose where it doesn't belong into the well-being, into the health, into the jobs, into the lives of the American people. That is the truth.

Now, what are we trying to do? Today, we want to protect individuals from being punished if they want to try to come to the United States but haven't had a vaccine; again, a vaccine which the CDC Director says does nothing for transmission. Those are the truths.

Here is the fact: Right now, a vaccinated noncitizen with COVID can enter the United States, via air travel, but an unvaccinated noncitizen who doesn't have COVID would be denied entry. That is the logic of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle; that is, there is no logic. That is the problem.

Everything about COVID has been free of logic and, rather, full of emotion. That is the truth.

We have been destroying the American economy. We have been destroying the future of our children; forcing them into the corners with masks; forcing them to be denied education. We have been destroying the futures of families

whose family members have lost jobs; who haven't been able to serve; who haven't been able to carry out their livelihoods as doctors, as nurses, as public servants who have been unable to carry out their jobs, including men and women in uniform, until Republicans demanded, in December, that we protect our men and women in uniform from getting fired for daring to say I don't want to have a needle stuck in my arm when there is plenty of evidence indicating myocarditis and other concerns that arise from it.

I wonder why we haven't had any committee hearings by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle diving into the origins of COVID, diving into the side effects of the vaccine?

Well, we are going to do it now, and history is going to judge us, and we are going to be on the side of protecting the American people.

I will tell you one last thing: This is the capital city of the United States of America, and Congress has the authority to protect the people who want to visit here and to make sure that American citizens are the ones who vote. It is not a State. It is our Nation's Capital seat.

□ 1315

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that H.R. 185 does not take effect unless it is certified that it won't decrease Social Security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the bedrock of our Nation's social safety net. Since its inception, it has lifted millions of our seniors out of poverty. Protecting the benefits that Social Security provides should be a priority for this Congress, for everyone in this Congress, as my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills.

Democrats are going to continue to push to ensure that these vital benefits are protected and will continue to give Republicans every opportunity to ease the American people's anxiety by demonstrating with their votes, including on this measure, that they do not intend to cut Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, my dad died 5 years ago. I think one of the most precious moments I remember with him as a child is going with him to vote back in the late 1960s, early 1970s, when the polling stations had the

boxes you would go in and the curtains would close and you would go in and pull a lever.

My dad wanted to make sure that we all knew, me and my three brothers, just how important voting was. It is not only our right; it is our responsibility as U.S. citizens.

Today, I rise in support of the rule, House Resolution 24. Free, fair, and trusted elections are the most sacred and the most essential part of our democracy for a healthy republic.

Unfortunately, the D.C. Council has tried to undermine the voice of American citizens who vote in D.C. by granting illegal aliens the right to vote. This is wrong. We know it is wrong. It jeopardizes the sanctity of our elections. Law-abiding U.S. citizens should not be disenfranchised by noncitizens voting.

Preserving the integrity of our elections could not be more important. We must trust the vote. We must protect the vote. We must ensure the highest level of confidence for all Americans.

If the D.C. Council allows illegal voters to exercise the right to vote, this would have massive affects across our Nation.

Where would it end?

Our Constitution has set forth the founding law which determines voting rights, and it could not be more clear. The 26th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution says: "The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

The Constitution is clear, Mr. Speaker. The right to vote is a privilege reserved for U.S. citizens, not illegal aliens.

Let me continue to section 2: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." That is what we are here today to do, with appropriate legislation, this resolution.

The right to vote is one of the most sacred rights we have. It is a bedrock of our society. It is a fundamental part of what we are as a Nation. We cannot throw this right away to the D.C. Council. We will not let it happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this resolution and join my colleagues to take a stand to protect the integrity of our elections, the right of every U.S. citizen, including my late father.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 26 are blatant attempts to undermine D.C. Home Rule. These resolutions are explicit efforts by Members of Congress to interfere in local government. They aim to directly override the D.C. Council and dictate what D.C. residents can and cannot do on a local level.

I firmly believe that the District of Columbia, like any other jurisdiction across the country, should be allowed to govern itself. I am just confused

that my Republican friends, who have such a deep commitment to federalism—federalism, where decisions are best made at the local level—why they would work to impede the right of 700,000 American citizens to self-govern?

It is critical that we fiercely protect this right on behalf of citizens living in D.C. We weren't voted to be D.C. City Council members. D.C. citizens didn't ask for our say in local matters. I trust my mayor of the city of Alexandria, Justin Wilson, to represent me ably there, and everyone else respects the people in their hometown, their home States, to do the same.

I am certainly not here offering to overturn local city council rulemaking in Kentucky or Georgia or Texas, but I am sure I could find plenty to disagree with.

We have got to respect the American democratic process and allow the people of D.C. to govern themselves. If we, as a Congress, value and respect the principle of local self-governance that makes up the core of our democracy, it is hypocritical of us to revoke that right for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly join me in opposing H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 26.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, let's just sort this out in our minds for a minute here.

Giving the privilege that our soldiers have fought for, the very cornerstone privilege of voting in this country, to people that have broken into this country and are here in this city illegally, granting them the right to vote, the people all across the fruited plain have got to believe that they are out of their minds here to extend that privilege to people whose first act was to break into this country. Now, they want to confer the privilege of voting and deciding who the decisionmakers in Washington, D.C., are going to be for them. It is absurd.

Now, there are a lot of things going on with D.C. politics and demands for the area here. I understand, on some level, part of it. But D.C. is about one-eighteenth the size of Rhode Island. Its population is only a little bit larger than Fresno, California, one of the towns in my home State.

They are demanding statehood?

It is right in the Constitution that the District of Columbia will be kept separate from any State, so it doesn't have undue influence by a State in conducting the business of the city and of the district and of the Federal Government housed here.

It just shows that Congress, having been authorized and given the duties of overseeing the district, needs to reassert itself once again, because the council here is out of control, thinking that that is a good idea, with some of the crime legislation that is being

talked about. But the right to vote being conferred upon people whose very first act was to break into this country, people are really wondering if this place has lost its collective mind.

I support this legislation to put D.C. back on the right path, the right foot, of following the law. It would undermine elections all across this country to have the idea of illegal immigrants voting in this city or other ones around the country.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, these measures today do nothing to address the important issues facing American families. These resolutions are misguided and unserious at best and deeply undemocratic at their core. House Republicans continue to waste precious time and taxpayer dollars on power struggles and political stunts.

Republican leadership's acquiescence to the fringe forces in their party is a disservice to the American public. With all of the challenges this Congress should contend with, an extremist overreach to nullify democratically passed legislation and rolling back life-saving COVID protections is a waste of precious time and resources.

My Democratic colleagues and I are here to work on behalf of the American people and are ready to do the serious work of delivering for them, fighting for better jobs and safer communities. We will oppose extremist attempts to stoke division, to undermine government institutions, and to threaten fundamental American freedoms.

I invite my colleagues to work across the aisle, to work together on the issues that matter to all of our constituents: lowering prices; addressing housing, healthcare, and education needs; making our communities safer; and protecting our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, if individuals would like the power to vote in our elections, they must go through the legal process to become U.S. citizens, like the millions before them did.

Ask yourself: Should we be extending the right to vote, no matter at any level, to the CCP members who work at the Chinese Embassy?

Should we extend the right to vote in elections in this country to members of the Russian Federation staff at their embassy?

That would happen under the D.C. voting rights legislation.

If individuals attack, kill, steal, and destroy property, they should be punished for those offenses, not let off the hook. These are basic tenets of our society, of our democracy, and of this great Nation.

The District of Columbia is the seat of the Federal Government, and as

such has a special place in American society. Congress has a clear responsibility under the Home Rule Act to block policies that jeopardize the democratic rights and the lives of American citizens.

We have an opportunity today not just to provide much-needed oversight to D.C.'s disastrous policies but to also finally end a draconian vaccine mandate that has kept families and friends apart.

Let's remember that around the world, other countries have ended their own COVID-19 vaccine mandates for air travelers. Europe, Canada, and elsewhere no longer require Americans to arrive with a proof of vaccination.

Why has the administration persisted in upholding this mandate?

With the proof about the vaccine's true efficacy and limitation in preventing the spread of COVID, why have they so obsessively upheld this mandate or any of the others, for that matter?

The time has come for Congress to step in and to remind the administration that the pandemic is over and allow families and friends and loved ones to reunite after years of forced separation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SCANLON is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 97

Strike the first section after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for further amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in section 4 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and re-

port the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Insert at the end the following:

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

“At the end, add the following:

“This Act shall not be effective unless and until the date on which the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that this Act will not result in a decrease to Social Security benefits.”.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 208, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—217

Alford	Duarte	Huizenga
Allen	Duncan	Issa
Amodei	Dunn (FL)	Jackson (TX)
Armstrong	Edwards	James
Babin	Ellzey	Johnson (LA)
Bacon	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Baird	Estes	Johnson (SD)
Balderson	Ezell	Jordan
Banks	Fallon	Joyce (OH)
Barr	Feenstra	Joyce (PA)
Bean (FL)	Ferguson	Kean (NJ)
Bentz	Finstad	Kelly (MS)
Bergman	Fischbach	Kelly (PA)
Bice	Fitzgerald	Kiggans (VA)
Biggs	Fitzpatrick	Kiley
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Kim (CA)
Bishop (NC)	Flood	Kustoff
Boebert	Foxx	LaHood
Bost	Franklin, C.	LaLota
Brecheen	Scott	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Fry	Lamborn
Buck	Fulcher	Langworthy
Buchson	Gaetz	Latta
Burchett	Gallagher	LaTurner
Burgess	Garbarino	Lawler
Burlison	Garcia, Mike	Lee (FL)
Calvert	Gimenez	Lesko
Cammack	Gonzales, Tony	Letlow
Carey	Good (VA)	Loudermilk
Carl	Gooden (TX)	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Granger	Luna
Chavez-DeRemer	Graves (LA)	Luttrell
Ciscomani	Graves (MO)	Mace
Cline	Green (TN)	Malliotakis
Cloud	Green, Al (TX)	Mann
Clyde	Greene (GA)	Massie
Cole	Griffith	Mast
Collins	Grothman	McCarthy
Comer	Guest	McCaul
Crane	Guthrie	McClain
Crawford	Hageman	McClintock
Crenshaw	Harris	McCormick
Curtis	Harshbarger	McHenry
D'Esposito	Hern	Meuser
Davidson	Higgins (LA)	Miller (IL)
De La Cruz	Hill	Miller (OH)
DesJarlais	Hinson	Miller (WV)
Diaz-Balart	Houchin	Miller-Meeks
Donalds	Hudson	Mills

Molinaro	Rosendale	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Tiffany
Mooney	Roy	Timmons
Moore (AL)	Rutherford	Turner
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Valadao
Moran	Santos	Van Drew
Murphy	Scalise	Van Dyne
Newhouse	Schweikert	Van Orden
Norman	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Nunn (IA)	Self	Walberg
Obernolte	Sessions	Waltz
Ogles	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Owens	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Palmer	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Pence	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Perry	Smucker	Williams (NY)
Pfleger	Stauber	Williams (TX)
Posey	Steel	Wilson (SC)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Wittman
Rodgers (WA)	Stell	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Yakym
Rogers (KY)	Strong	Zinke
Rose	Tenney	

NAYS—208

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Pascrell
Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Payne
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Gomez	Peltola
Balint	Gonzalez,	Perez
Barragan	Vicente	Peters
Beatty	Gottheimer	Petterson
Bera	Grijalva	Phillips
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Pocan
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pressley
Bonamici	Horsford	Quigley
Bowman	Houlahan	Ramirez
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Raskin
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Ross
Brownley	Huffman	Ruiz
Budzinski	Ivey	Ruppersberger
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Ryan
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Salinas
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Sanchez
Cárdenas	Jacobs	Sarbanes
Carson	Jayapal	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kamlager-Dove	Schiff
Casar	Kaptur	Schneider
Case	Keating	Scholten
Casten	Kelly (IL)	Schrier
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Scott, David
Cherfilus-	Kilmer	Sewell
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Sherman
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Sherrill
Cicilline	Kuster	Slotkin
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Smith (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Sorensen
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Soto
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Stansbury
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Stanton
Correa	Levin	Stevens
Costa	Lieu	Strickland
Courtney	Lofgren	Swalwell
Craig	Lynch	Sykes
Crockett	Magaziner	Takano
Crow	Manning	Thanedar
Cuellar	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davids (KS)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McColum	Titus
Davis (NC)	McGarvey	Tlaib
Dean (PA)	McGovern	Tokuda
DeGette	Meeks	Tonko
DeLauro	Menendez	Torres (CA)
DelBene	Meng	Torres (NY)
Deluzio	Moore (WI)	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Morelle	Trone
Dingell	Moskowitz	Underwood
Doggett	Moulton	Vargas
Escobar	Mrvan	Vasquez
Eshoo	Mullin	Veasey
Espallat	Nadler	Velázquez
Evans	Napolitano	Wasserman
Fletcher	Neal	Schultz
Foster	Neguse	Waters
Foushee	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Frankel, Lois	Norcross	Wexton
Frost	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Galleo	Omar	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Panetta	
Garcia (TX)	Pappas	

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt Johnson (GA) Nehls
Arrington Larson (CT) Spartz
Hunt Mfume Steube

□ 1352

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. PORTER, Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, EVANS, MCGOVERN, and Ms. STANSBURY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. COLE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 208, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—217

Alford Ezell Kiley
Allen Fallon Kim (CA)
Amodei Feenstra Kustoff
Armstrong Ferguson LaHood
Babin Finstad LaLota
Bacon Fischbach LaMalfa
Baird Fitzgerald Lamborn
Balderson Fitzpatrick Langworthy
Banks Fleischmann Latta
Barr Flood LaTurner
Bean (FL) Foxx Lawler
Bentz Franklin, C. Lee (FL)
Bergman Scott Lesko
Bice Fry Letlow
Biggs Fulcher Loudermilk
Billakis Gaetz Lucas
Bishop (NC) Gallagher Luetkemeyer
Boebert Garbarino Luna
Bost Garcia, Mike Luttrell
Brecheen Gimenez Mace
Buchanan Golden (ME) Malliotakis
Buck Gonzales, Tony Mann
Bucshon Good (VA) Massie
Burchett Gooden (TX) Mast
Burgess Gosar McCarthy
Burlison Granger McCaul
Calvert Graves (LA) McClain
Cammack Graves (MO) McClintock
Carey Green (TN) McCormick
Carl Greene (GA) McHenry
Carter (GA) Griffith Meuser
Carter (TX) Grothman Miller (IL)
Chavez-DeRemer Guest Miller (OH)
Ciscomani Guthrie Miller (WV)
Cline Hageman Miller-Meeks
Cloud Harris Mills
Clyde Harshbarger Molinaro
Cole Hern Moolenaar
Collins Higgins (LA) Mooney
Comer Hill Moore (AL)
Crane Hinson Moore (UT)
Crawford Houchin Moran
Crenshaw Hudson Murphy
Curtis Huizenga Nehls
D'Esposito Issa Newhouse
Davidson Jackson (TX) Norman
De La Cruz James Nunn (IA)
DesJarlais Johnson (LA) Obernolte
Diaz-Balart Johnson (OH)
Donalds Johnson (SD)
Duarte Jordan Palmer
Duncan Joyce (OH) Pence
Dunn (FL) Joyce (PA) Perry
Edwards Kean (NJ) Pfluger
Ellzey Kelly (MS) Posey
Emmer Kelly (PA) Reschenthaler
Estes Giggans (VA) Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buddzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheriflus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Aderholt Johnson (GA)
Arrington Larson (CT)
Hunt Mfume

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Strong
Tennet
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne

NOES—208

Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas

NOT VOTING—9

Johnson (GA)
Larson (CT)
Mfume

Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

□ 1401

Mrs. PELTOLA changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet tonight in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of purporting to reserve seats prior to the joint session by placement of placards or personal items will not be allowed. Chamber security may remove these items from the seats. Members may reserve their seats only by physical presence following the security sweep of the Chamber.

All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in still photography or audio or video recording in the Chamber. Taking unofficial photographs detracts from the dignity of the proceedings and presents security and privacy challenges for the House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2033

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11 TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right